HON'BLE SRI G.S.SINGHVI, THE CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO.23640 OF 2005

AND

WRIT APPEAL NO.2364 OF 2005

WRIT PETITION NO.23640 OF 2005:

Between:

The Commercial & Industrial Finance

(Pvt) Ltd., D.No.3-6-161, Hyderguda, Hyderabad,

rep. by its Director, Mahesh Chand

…Petitioner

and

The Commissioner, Serlingampalli

Municipality, Ranga Reddy District …Respondent

Counsel for the petitioner :Sri N.Bharat Babu

Counsel for the respondent :Sri Polisetti Radha Krishna,

Standing Counsel for

Municipalities.

WRIT APPEAL NO.2364 OF 2005

Between:

The Commercial & Industrial Finance

(Pvt) Ltd., D.No.3-6-161, Hyderguda, Hyderabad,

rep. by its Director, Mahesh Chand

…Appellant

and

The Commissioner, Serlingampalli

Municipality, Ranga Reddy District …Respondent

::J U D G M E N T::

Counsel for the appellant :Sri N.Bharat Babu

Counsel for the respondent :Sri Polisetti Radha Krishna,

Standing Counsel for

Municipalities.

6th December, 2005

(Per G.S.Singhvi, CJ):

This appeal is directed against order dated 03-11-2005 passed by the learned Single Judge, thereby he dismissed the writ petition filed by the appellant questioning the sanction granted by the competent authority of Serlingampalli Municipality, Ranga Reddy district, for raising construction on land comprising of Survey Nos.18, 19, 44, (44/1) 45, 56, 69, 77, 87, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98 and 117/2 situated in village Miapur, Serlingampally mandal, Ranga Reddy district.

After arguing the case for some time, learned counsel for the appellant made a request that his client may be permitted to withdraw the appeal as also the writ petition with liberty to file fresh petition with better particulars and by impleading the affected persons as parties.

In the peculiar facts of the case, we deem it proper to accept the request of the learned counsel for the appellant. Consequently, this appeal as also writ petition No.23640 of 2005 are dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the appellant to file fresh petition on the same causes. No order as to costs.

G.S.SINGHVI, CJ

6th December, 2005

R.SUBHASH REDDY, J

vrn